

13500
ADMINISTRATIVE
RECORD

1623342 - R8 SEMS

280318

Qualitative Research Summary
Conducted by:
Dan Jones & Associates Inc.

- ☒ AR
- ☐ SITE
- ☐ POST DECISION PUBLIC DOCUMENT
- ☐ PRIVILEGED/CLAIM
- ☐ FOIA EXEMPT/CLAIM
- ☐ WORK PERFORMED DOCUMENT

CONTRACT #

FILE PLAN # 3.01.05

KEYWORD #(S)

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH SUMMARY
conducted and compiled on behalf of

ASARCO

conducted by
Dan Jones & Associates Inc.
Salt Lake City, Utah

February 5, 1997



515 South 700 East • Trolley Corners, Suite 3H • Salt Lake City, Utah 84102 • FAX (801) 322-5725 • Phone (801) 322-5722

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Dan Jones & Associates Inc., a professional public opinion and market research company located in Salt Lake City, Utah, was commissioned by Rob Jolley of Utah Lobbying, Inc. to conduct qualitative research on behalf of ASARCO, the American Smelting and Refinery Company.

The purposes of the research are to gain important perceptions and feedback from residents of a selected segment of old historic Sandy City who live in areas that have been designated by the Environmental Protection Agency to have a high propensity for elevated lead levels in their soil.

Specifically, the research is designed to obtain descriptive data regarding experiences dealing with the E.P.A., ASARCO, the Department of Environmental Quality, and other entities with regard to literally or potentially removing soil, landscaping, fences, sidewalks, etc. on respective properties. The research is also designed to determine preferences for remediation, if and when soil is deemed potentially hazardous.

The group consisted of residents of the select area who are deemed as opinion leaders — those involved in church, civic, and education activities.

METHODOLOGY

In order to meet the objectives of the research, one focus group session was conducted on Wednesday, February 5, 1997 at noon. Respondents represented older residents and those having young children at home.

Names of potential respondents were selected randomly by professional recruiters representing Dan Jones & Associates. Eight individuals participated in the focus group. All currently reside in the old historic part of Sandy City.

The group was facilitated by a professional focus group moderator representing Dan Jones & Associates. Participants were not initially told the sponsor of the research, although the sponsor was revealed near the conclusion of the session.

The proceedings were audio and video taped for internal use only. Client representatives viewed the session via one-way glass at the facility. Participants were served a luncheon and paid a standard cash incentive at the conclusion of the session.

The reader is cautioned that the findings reported here are qualitative, not quantitative, in nature. This study was designed to explore HOW respondents feel and behave rather than determine HOW MANY think or act in specific ways. Therefore, the findings are not intended to be projected on a larger population, but used to better understand the underlying motives and nuances that factor into decision making processes among this select group of Sandy residents.

This analysis includes a moderator's summary and transcript of the session.

MODERATOR SUMMARY

SALIENT ISSUES

Growth related issues head the list of concerns among this group of Sandy residents. Inadequate planning and zoning, bulging schools, crime, shrinking open space, high density housing, and pedestrian safety are mentioned freely by respondents as the things they worry about most for their community. No person mentions environmental risks prior to prompting, indicating that lead in the soil is not on the "A list" of concerns.

SOIL REMEDIATION

Only after prompting do respondents mention soil testing and remediation in their area, and all are aware of someone having undergone the experience. One individual had her soil removed. The research indicates a number of important findings regarding remediation; namely,

- The assumption that the E.P.A. has completed the work — the agency came out and tested the soil, took care of those affected, and it is now a moot issue. One respondent (a scientist) captures general sentiment by noting, "I'm a scientist, and I am satisfied with what they have done and what they've found."
- Residents feel no significant health concerns as a result of lead in their soil.
- Participants (particularly those with young children) express some concern for the safety of children, but they feel sufficient actions have been taken by the E.P.A. and that the efforts have been precautionary rather than real.
- Many respondents question the need for soil removal at all, and respondents as a whole are skeptical about the need for continued soil remediation.

- The majority considers continued E.P.A. efforts as wasteful, calling any additional plans to remove soil "make-work" projects. Respondents wonder why the E.P.A. is pushing this, describing the process as "making work for themselves" because the agency "has money left over."
- Respondents say no history of medical problems exist as a result of lead in their soil, and that is the true yardstick by which they measure need for remediation.
- Losing old trees and other vegetation that gives Sandy's historic district its character is disquieting to this group of residents. Clearly, this group of residents wants to preserve the historic landscape.
- Although most of the respondents "are concerned" about possible lead in their soil, they are not convinced there is real danger, and LEAD IN THE SOIL "IS NOT A PRIORITY" to them. As one respondent says, "Why are we spending so much time on this when there are more important problems facing Sandy residents?"
- Participants express skepticism and distrust about government agencies, describing those targeted for soil remediation as "having no choice" and that the E.P.A. threatened that their property values would drop.
- As the remediation process draws out, residents ASSUME any danger has passed. As one respondent says, "If this were an issue and a true health hazard like they claim it is, then why was it not taken care of when they found out?"
- Respondents report improvements in some yards, while some yards look worse, depending on the condition of the landscape prior to remediation.

SOURCE OF FEAR

A few focus group members describe an uneasiness about safety of their soil, describing the source of the fear as fear of the "unseen." Some worry about discoveries of health risks in the future, and others say that ANY risk to children -- even 1 percent -- is unacceptable.

Others say the blanket of concern stems from lack of communication and education about possible health risks, calling the process "a mystery." The research indicates that residents desire objective information and "concrete results of soil and blood tests" taken from residents in their area.

CPM versus SOIL REMOVAL

All group members clearly favor a COMMUNITY PROTECTION MEASURE PROGRAM over soil removal. Respondents want three things; namely, SOIL TESTING, REGULAR BLOOD TESTING OF CHILDREN, AND ONGOING COMMUNICATION AND STATUS REPORTS -- in other words, a community protection measure program. They do not favor soil removal as the first line of defense. As one respondent explains, "We want better proof, and education."

Third-party, objective information is in order. A number of respondents would use their own doctors for blood testing in an effort to gain surety. This finding is consistent with previous qualitative research on the subject.

When the sponsor of the research (ASARCO) is divulged near the conclusion of the session, respondents express understanding of the company's dilemma and support the company's efforts to take precautions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus group is consistent with information gained in other sessions conducted by Dan Jones & Associates two years ago. Communication with residents is key to their support of a CPM program. ASARCO's campaign must include the company's history and responsibility, disclosure of health agency statistics that no real health risks exist, and that the CPM program will take care of all the necessary health precautions.

Community Protection Measures Program Focus Group

Sandy Opinion Leaders

Monday, February 5, 1997 (Noon)

Moderator: Welcome and introduction. Let's begin by asking each of you to introduce yourself. Tell us your name, your occupation, and where you live, and then we'll go on from there. Kelli, shall we start with you?

Kelli: That'll be fine. I'm Kelli Nielsen. I live just off of 90th South and 7th East -- if you know where the cemetery is on the 90th South, that's my back yard. I am a homemaker. I guess I am kind of employed at ZCMI, but I only work one day a month, so I don't consider myself employed. I do gift wrap. I have four boys -- 8, 6, 3 and 1. I have a lot of fun.

Deanne: My name is Deanne and I live off of 8400 South and 3rd East. I have three children -- 6, 5 and 2. I'm the PTA president this year and that is a full-time job and working at home is a full-time job and part-time I teach aerobics.

Francis: I'm Francis Bills and I live at 8971 South 220 East. I live on the freeway. I fought it gallantly at every city meeting but I lost. I am going to take my irrigation water, even if I have to repair my own ditch. I live on the same block. My property is pretty well confined. I've lived in Sandy all but six years of my life, or for over 70 years.

Lila: My name is Lila Wilson and I live just on the other side of (unclear) Magna about 220 East. I was raised in Sandy up on 7th East, and I have lived at my present address for 38 years. In college I majored in accounting and I have done some of that and I also have taught high school. I have been involved in the community at a community quadrant in Sandy.

Ty: My name is Ty Harrison and I am neighbors with a number of these people, although I don't get to see them. I live on 8800 South and 530 East in the old historic district in a house on the national register of historic places. It has been restored. We've lived there six years but I was born and raised in Sandy. I was born and raised in the Crescent Quadrant. I was out of state for 20 years. We just moved back ten years ago. I'm a member of the Sandy Recreational Trails Council and I'm a biology teacher at Westminster College.

Pat: My name is Pat Meekins and I live on 8800 South and 5th East, so Ty and I are neighbors. I'm a biology major, so we've talked about trees and plants and stuff before. I do research at the University part-time. I have served as PTA president before, too, though not in elementary, where it's a big job -- in middle school, where it is not quite so bad. I have three kids still hanging on at home. The youngest is 17. Only one has left so far.

Eddie: My name is Eddie Kinder and I work for the University of Utah making orthopedic implants for the doctors. All doctors are basically mad inventors so I give them a piece of paper and let them create what they think they want. I live on 8400 South and about 4th East. I'm the guy who has the llamas up there.

*****: You're the llama man!? (Laughter) My boys love your llamas.

Scott: My name is Scott Adleman and I'm the district manager with Blockbuster Video and I live just south of 90th South and 220 East. I have three little girls -- 4, 2, and 7 months.

Moderator: Let me go through a couple of things first and feel free to comment when you're ready. You've noticed that all of you live in the same general area. In fact, in a fairly specific area. We are here today to learn about the needs and perceptions of people who live in your proximity. What do you think are the most pressing issues facing your geographical area right now? Your neighborhood? Your community?

*****: Growth.

Moderator: What do you mean by 'growth'?

Scott: Apartments proposed.

*****: I was referring to the growth of Sandy as a whole and how it is going to affect us.

Moderator: How will it affect you?

*****: I'm not sure.

*****: You ain't seen nothin' yet until those apartments get built.

*****: We have some apartments coming, but I see what's happening in the schools and I can't imagine that the growth and having more children coming in, moving in, whether they are apartments or bussed, it is going to be a tremendous challenge to handle that growth however it happens.

Moderator: So many issues spin off of growth it sounds like?

Kelli: Yes, it is really true, and along with the growth comes crime and that is a real issue. We have small children and the growth of the area and with people moving in from different areas and different cultures and that, crime always seems to increase.

Moderator: Many of you have lived there for several years, it sounds like. Is it better now than it used to be? Is it getting worse?

Francis: It is getting worse.

Moderator: How so?

Francis: Take Sandy School into consideration for one reason -- the apartments that surround it accept oriental people, a large influx of Orientals, and then they complain about the ability of the teachers to teach. It's a hard job to learn a language. I think the teachers are doing the best they can, and I'm sure they are regarded negatively sometimes.

Moderator: So again, this is a growth related issue?

Francis: Yes, it is.

Pat: Crime is something that worries myself and my husband. Deterioration of the neighborhood, too.

Eddie: My concern is on the same growth issue. I've met the gentleman on the end and we've worked together to talk about how they are consuming every piece of ground and with all these kids and all these houses going up, where are we going to have some place for these kids to go do something? Besides sneak behind someone's house to do graffiti or whatever they're doing? There is no open ground. In the meetings I've gone to in Sandy they have already looked and said, 'Hey, where is the open ground?' And that ground is not there. This lady is saying she is fighting to keep irrigation water. I've got an acre and I'm fighting to keep mine. They are trying to take all these things away from us that are part of our lives.

Moderator: 'They' meaning who?

Eddie: Whomever. The city planners. Their inability to keep spaces open. I don't know where these apartments are going, but if they want to put apartments in there, no matter what the people are saying, there go the apartments.

Scott: They are putting them in all those bare fields east of State Street and just north of Main Street. My concern -- I've only been there about three and a half years is all -- and with my three little girls growing up right now, my biggest concern is that my oldest will be in Kindergarten next year and will have to cross 90th there and they just widened it and that really concerns me big time. And the fact that kids at the age are wanting to play outside and there are no sidewalks at all. I think my concerns are along those lines as my girls are getting older here and starting to venture out a little bit.

Moderator: So it sounds like space and crime and growth are the issues with many of you. If you were to describe the level of safety you perceive in your neighborhood, how safe is it? Tell me about crime, streets, environmental hazards, those sorts of things.

Ty: Can I speak to that? I kind of disagree with Pat. I have felt more safe here where I live in the historic district than any place I've ever lived. I kind of disagree in terms of crime. Of course, we did have a drug house explode a few blocks away, but that is going to happen any place. Most of the people I've known in Salt lake have had their homes burglarized several times in the high income areas, and in old Sandy historic district, I can't see crime as a significant thing. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't see it as important there.

Moderator: We are not looking at right and wrong here, but at different perceptions, and I do appreciate hearing those differences.

Ty: What I see lacking in Sandy is the urban amenities, including trails, which Sandy has not been able to get its act together to provide. I've been trying for five or ten years to get Sandy to start building trails for kids to bicycle on and to get to the stores and around the community. It's been planned, but it has not been a priority in our urban planning. It's starting to come -- I guess I've been impatient. The historic district does have a couple of parks, but I am really upset that the city has not been able to devote more resources to the historic museum in our district.

Moderator: So these sound like planning issues and so forth.

Ty: They are important planning issues for the historic district and for making it nice to live there. It includes places and things for kids to do as well as adults.

Moderator: Let's focus more on environmental issues here. Tell me environmentally how you feel about where you live.

Francis: One of the things that they did for the most part was going to the city for the parks and they have taken planters and dug them up for Novel and so forth.

Moderator: Now why did they do that?

Francis: I figured it out and I said boy, they'd have to eat a lot of dirt to get that amount of lead out of it.

Ty: Toxic levels of lead and arsenic from two old historic smelters.

Francis: It used to be all smelter there. It used to be all on the south side but the wind would carry it. So they have fixed it to look nice. One thing I would like to say is that the city has let people

borrow money to fix up their homes and put up siding. I was gone for 18 months and I noticed a lot of changes because I do a lot of walking.

Moderator: Who paid for that?

Francis: The city would loan the people money for that. I went to practically every city council meeting and every planning commission meeting for three years. With the exception of one, most of them looked at that area as we'll do that after everyone else. But the EPA issue, I don't know if they'll do any more this year. They did some last year. This is the second or third year I think.

Moderator: Why did they do that?

Francis: They came and tested our soil in places and if you had so much on there, they had to take soil off for 18 inches down. They took it all and then brought in other soil. Some areas were small. All of these new little trees, some of them didn't grow, some of the raspberries that were planted didn't grow....

Moderator: Do you feel safer now?

Francis: I've never really worried much about that, except my husband won't let me go out walking late at night by myself, which I do miss.

Moderator: But do you feel safer with the soil?

Francis: I never had a problem with the soil, ever. That's why I said I felt like it was a farce, a government EPA conscience.

Moderator: I would like to hear from the rest of you on this issue. Deanne?

Deanne: I was just informed that for young children playing in the dirt a lot it can cause negative effects. Our home was tested and it was fine, but for children in our community I felt like if that really is a long term thing, then it was worth it. It was hard for me, not being a scientist, and there was a lot of skepticism in the neighborhood as to whether or not it was really needed. My husband is an engineer and he wondered if that was really an issue or not. If the issue was as major as they thought it was and if the reasoning holds true, then it is worth it if it cleans it up.

Moderator: Help me understand the skepticism -- why it exists.

Eddie: Because people have lived there for generations without mental retardation problems.

*****: Without any problems.

Ty: I understand all of the issues and if children are going to be playing in the dirt and licking their fingers, which they will, and this could happen for generations, so this was kind of insurance to insure that the small children do not get damaged from lead and arsenic in the soil. I hated to see it happen, because it destroyed a lot of the old landscaping.

Francis: That's right.

Ty: In terms of an environmental issue, all of the big old trees in Sandy City have died of old age and they have been replaced, either on the street or in people's yards. Sandy needs more big trees, but you can't grow them very fast. In our neighborhood, some big old trees were cut down that should never have been cut down.

Moderator: Someone called it a farce. What do you think?

Ty: It is real. I saw the concentration of lead and arsenic in people's yards and feel something should have been done.

Moderator: Was soil removal the correct thing to have done?

Ty: As long as it is under grass or vegetation it's okay, but people are going to dig up grass and plant gardens and kids are going to play in the dirt, so that is the only permanent solution, to haul it away and dispose of it as toxic waste, which is what they did.

Moderator: Does anyone have a differing view, or a similar view? Does anyone want to comment on this? You have talked about several issues, but for a moment I want to hone in on the EPA soil removal. What is the outcome of that? Do you feel safer now? Has anyone had their soil removed from their yard? Anyone here? Just Francis?

Scott: They came and tested our ground and water and all and we have a water filter because we have children so we feel safer that way, probably psychological, but I don't know. It might make us feel safer that something is being done and if it's a precautionary deal. To me it is better safe than sorry.

Moderator: What is the down side to having soil removed?

Scott: We actually have not had it removed at our place, but it would be the disruption to the yard and having it intruded upon. That would make your doubts go higher, too, thinking what is going on in my yard? I think it would cause fear.

Moderator: Has this issue impacted you at all? Anything about your life personally affected? This could be about safety or property value -- those sorts of things. I would like you to write down a number on your yellow pad from one to ten, with ten meaning that the quality of your soil is a great

concern to you and one meaning you are not concerned at all. Let's say the soil in your yard right now.

*****: Not if it is a priority, but a concern? It may not be a priority to me, but I am concerned that my children are well.

Scott: 10.

Eddie: 10.

*****: I'm sorry to say it but 5.

Francis: One is the lowest, so one.

Lila: One.

Deanne: 9.

Kelli: 6.

Ty: 5.

Moderator: It looks like those of you with young children at home may be more concerned than others. Help me understand -- did the EPA come in, do there job and leave everything okay? What is the status of this right now?

*****: I don't really know because I live -- well, they have never even tested my house. My address is 570 East and Scott, yours is 220 East? So in the three blocks distance, they have not even concerned me with it, so I don't know what EPA has done.

Moderator: Deanne talked about having it a priority. Help me understand.

Deanne: I feel that I am concerned about the overall safety of our community and I am concerned for my children and other children because when they play outside they aren't always going to be in my yard. My yard was tested borderline or below, so they felt it was not an issue we needed to be concerned about, but four doors down it was a concern and my children play in the sand there and dig and everything else. So I am thinking there are children all over the neighborhood that play in different areas and you can't control what the do in those areas. As far as how concerned I am, very. But is it something I always think about? Would I start up a petition? It is probably not a priority to me because of everything else in my life, but it is a concern. Those are two different things to me.

Moderator: What happens if your soil is removed? Does anyone know anyone whose soil has been removed?

*****: (Several voices) Yes.

Moderator: What happened? What changed for them?

*****: They don't have a lot of trees anymore, which really bothered me. In fact, I was told that EPA still has some money left and they would like to target a few more homes if there are some borderline homes out there.

Moderator: Do you think that's a good idea?

*****: I suppose you can carry it too far.

Moderator: Has it gone too far yet?

*****: I would think so.

*****: Going to far? I don't know about Sandy, but in Midvale, they scorched the earth there. My husband said he would like to have our yard done just to get landscaping redone, but I said no way. We have some big old trees in our yard and I would bitterly hate to lose those. The EPA will dig around them but they will not promise they will survive.

Moderator: It sounds like we have a balance scale here. You have this yard with big trees and a historic look to it and yet you have this other side here where there may be a need to remediate the soil somehow.

*****: I'm leaning that way, too, but then my children are all older and it might affect others who move in later with young children and that might be a cause for concern. That is basically the problem I see.

Moderator: Would you agree that this is something you care about but do not worry about very often? Is that true with most of you? What is the biggest concern then? And what would you suggest as an alternative to removing soil?

Eddie: As part of the armed forces and so on, every time I've dealt with the government they've lied to me.

Moderator: So the government lies?

Eddie: Yes. The time they sent GIs down to stand there and watch the atomic bomb being set off and told nothing will happen to them -- time after time! I have a hard time accepting the government at face value. They said nothing happened to the GIs in Desert Storm but many of those guys are really sick and unable to deal with life anymore. They still won't say what's wrong with them.

Moderator: So what is your take on this?

Eddie: I have a definite distrust for what the government tries to pound towards me.

Moderator: Is that the government, meaning EPA?

Eddie: EPA, the armed services -- they tell lies one right after another.

Moderator: Is the EPA lying?

Eddie: I have nothing to base that on, but history keeps repeating itself and I have watched them stand there to tell us nothing is going to happen and it does.

Moderator: Help me understand what you would like to have done? There must be something in the soil in your area....

Eddie: The old smelter and the fallout that blew around -- that all happened before I was there.

Moderator: So there are different things that can be done? Number one, nothing. Number two, soil removal -- the option they have taken. What is your view?

Eddie: I honestly don't know what should be done. I am aware of the issue out there but I don't have the time to get involved in it.

Lila: I would really like to say something. I was involved in this at the Quadrant from the whole time, since they came in to test the soil. I have a background in this that many do not have of what actually took place. It is really interesting because Mr. Adleman and I only live around the corner from each other and some of our homes were never, ever tested, and yet they went farther down the street and tested their homes. They did my brother's home three different times and didn't find anything that would cause it -- still they were coming back and testing again. That is why I said in some things I felt it was a farce. There were some areas where it was higher and I could see them doing that, but there were other areas that were never affected.

Moderator: Are you saying they were inconsistent?

Lila: Very much. They never did test mine at all ever. I am only three houses from Mr. Adleman.

Moderator: Kelli, being borderline do you sense that maybe this will be an issue for you and down the road your soil may be tested?

Kelli: I don't think they will test my area. I don't know of anyone in my neighborhood that was tested at all. I don't really think there is anything different to do. I think that all of the different avenues have been exhausted already. This is the way to handle the problem -- to take the soil back.

Moderator: Is it a moot issue now?

*****: (Several voices) Yes.

Moderator: Why?

Ty: I understand the sampling scheme that these companies use to do it, and they can't possibly sample every yard, so they sample statistically, so I think they have identified the important stuff and hauled it away and the issue has been solved. I don't think it should be that much of an issue.

Moderator: Are any of you aware that the EPA is planning to do some soil removal in your area?

*****: That is the first I've heard.

Pat: That's rumor. I can't substantiate that. But the people three doors down from us, out of the blue, the only house on the street, had their whole yard re-done.

Moderator: Do you think there is an urgency? As a third party observer, if there is such a health issue, why has EPA taken so long to get this done?

*****: Exactly.

*****: I just wanted to say, I think that is the hardest part of this for me as a mother, that if this were an issue and a true health hazard like they claim it is, then why was it not taken care of when they found out? Why did it take so long? Why isn't there a check and balance here? Why is there just random testing? My reasoning says that maybe it's not quite as bad and the long term effects are not quite as bad, but they are letting us know worst case scenario so that they can do this project. For me, that is probably why it is not a priority, because it's not clear to me that it is really, really a problem. People have lived in historic Sandy for many, many years and never had a problem.

Moderator: Have any of you heard from the EPA or the state division of environmental quality?

Ty: Yes, they have contacted me several times and I have been invited to several public meetings.

Moderator: What do you think of those? Do those calm any fears you have?

Ty: I quizzed them because I'm a scientist and I was satisfied with what they had done and what they had found -- the contractors that EPA employed to come and do the analyses.

Moderator: So I am hearing most of you say there was a reason for concern, so the EPA came in and randomly tested some samples, and they did find some samples. They removed that soil. It's over and done with now, so what's the big deal?

Francis: I didn't have my soil removed, but they came and tested my yard and said I had arsenic. I said I had seven children and they don't eat dirt. I was angry because we had had all that dirt hauled in from out of the area to landscape our yard and they found arsenic by drilling down, and they were just making jobs for themselves.

Moderator: How did you know that?

Francis: If you know that you have hauled dirt in from long off where there are no smelters, I know the smelter area because I have lived there for over 75 years. I think the dirt is only bad along the railroad tracks and where the smelters sat, and the smelters sat on the west side of the tracks north from Sandy Main Street and just below my house where the hill drops. That's where they had the slag dump, and it has been taken away and they have built a nursing home.

Moderator: You seem to echo what Lila is saying -- it is not something you are very much concerned about.

Francis: I don't think that they did much at all but that it is a make-work project and it makes the economy look good.

Moderator: Looks like all of you know people who have had their soil removed. What is your sense from them? Do they feel safer now? Was it needed, justified, worth it?

Francis: Yes, in several places all the way down where the water came down from Little Cottonwood Canyon, which is beside the grade school and north from it approximately a mile. Most of those have been redone. The people were happy because the houses had been shacks and with what they got out of it they could build nice homes. It has upgraded the street immensely.

Moderator: Although you are concerned, you seem to be placated at this point.

Francis: I am. Have you seen what they have done with Midvale's slag dump and with all the houses they have? They had arsenic in the soil and they have replaced everything, but they were on a drainage point, and they are happy with it to have a bunch of new homes and nice lawns. My lawn grows as well as anyone else's. The places where they drilled, also -- we did not have to replace the whole yard, just the north half.

Moderator: What is the difference between the two sides of the yard then in terms of quality?

Francis: They are both just fine.

Moderator: Tell me what happened after the soil was removed from the yards you have seen?

*****: They replaced the dirt from somewhere.

Scott: I have not seen anyone's soil taken.

*****: They did the whole block for one woman -- the beautiful trees. It was just barely below the borderline, but she did not have any choice in it.

Ty: They threatened her with decreased property value. To many of these people they warned that they would not be able to sell the property at fair market value if they did not have the clean up.

Francis: That's also what they told everyone.

*****: And they gave them no choice.

*****: Across the street from us we had people who had just built a home and spent thousands of dollars to landscape it and two weeks after they were done, they came in and tested and started hauling dirt away. They took up all their sod and trees and all they had just put in and hauled it away. They wondered why they did not do this six months ago? Before they had even started building? If this was such an issue?

*****: So there were some hostile feelings for a while I think because they took things away and then didn't replace them like they said they would and then parts of their property they liked and it was hard.

Moderator: What happens if they just replace the top 18 inches? What about the soil underneath? What if those layers need to be tested later on?

Ty: These things do not move in the soil.

Moderator: If you had to remodel your home, would you be willing to take the dirt dug up out to the Salt Lake County landfill to have it disposed of? Has anyone thought of that?

*****: If it is contaminated, you couldn't take it out there. You would have to haul it out to Tooele or wherever they take contaminated dirt.

Moderator: Is that an issue?

Lila: The contractor disposed of it as it was dug up.

Moderator: Let's say that you undergo soil removal like Peggy did, is it taken care of now?

Ty: Yes.

Moderator: Even if she has to remodel her home?

*****: So like let's say she is building a basketball court under her home and they have to dig way down -- does she have to remove the soil herself? What if she did? How would they know?

Moderator: They would test again and find a high level.

Francis: If there was cement on it, they didn't worry about it. That's what they told me.

Scott: I'd be upset that they didn't do it right the first time.

Moderator: Let's go on. Does anyone know of the blood lead study results? What is safe and unsafe and to what degree is the blood level higher or lower in Sandy?

*****: They have never had any problems with blood -- that was the thing. Of the ones they did they did not find it, but they said it is always a concern that this will happen. They came into the homes to see if they had lead paint and they took samples of the children's blood and there were no cases. I was the Quadrant chairman, so I knew what was going on.

Scott: They did come into ours and check my wife, who was pregnant.

Moderator: How did she feel about that?

Scott: She was okay about it. If there were a concern, she wanted to know if there were a problem. She was relieved in a sense when they came back and said it was all fine. It set us at ease. She didn't feel violated or anything like that.

Moderator: Do you think it is a good idea to check blood levels from time to time? Or would there be some resistance to it?

Francis: I can see testing children.

Eddie: Especially with little kids, be safer rather than sorrier. So my philosophy is I would rather know that everything is okay and not have something creep up down the road.

Moderator: There is a spectrum here in terms of what the levels are and what happens at various levels. The Center for Disease Control guidelines for blood levels -- does anyone know what they are?

Ty: Is it 10 micrograms?

Moderator: Yes, it's 10 to 14 UGDL.

Ty: That is micrograms per deciliter of blood.

Moderator: At the level of 15 to 19, the result is frequent screening and nutritional and educational interventions. Between 20 and 44, children receive environmental evaluation within 10 days and medical treatment as needed. From 45 to 69, medical intervention. Seventy and above, very high, symptomatic of lead poisoning, immediate investigation. From your knowledge, did any of these reach above these levels?

Lila: No, because they had reports at a city council on what they found and when the blood levels came in, they didn't have anything like that.

Moderator: Where do you think this fear or concern came from? Where did it generate from? Deanne and Kelli mentioned earlier that they were fearful for their children. Where did that stem from?

Francis: It started in the New York or New England area because when this first came out we received in our home -- in fact, I still have studies at my home....

Moderator: Let me first ask Deanne and Kelli, who have young children. Scott, you may jump in here, too. Those of you who have young children mentioned you were more concerned for your children. Help me understand why.

Kelli: My concern stems from the fact that there is lead in the ground -- everyone said it, and it's not something that can be seen, so I think that an unseen concern is harder than something that can be seen, especially long term. If they are concerned about it now, what is the concern going to be

10 or 15 or 20 years from now? Is it going to get worse or better? I plan on living there long term and if that is the case, what is going to happen then?

Moderator: So health concerns?

Kelli: Right.

Deanne: I am not only concerned with their health as they play and grown, but you asked where that came from, and maybe because we have a fringe here who are skeptical about studies, but is this a real health issue? As a mother, if it is any issue, even a 1% chance that it could hurt a child, then that is enough to worry about. The track record, educating the public as to why they were doing this and showing the problems on the way and this is why we do this -- to avoid any problems in the future -- that education part was never done, so it was kind of a mystery. Some of the fear and concern came from not knowing and being told this is what could happen. For me, immediately I thought I don't want any of the could happens to happen to my children.

Moderator: That helps me understand that better. Let me give you two possible scenarios for some of the remediation for this. We talked about what you would like to have done -- what do you think should be done now to resolve this? Let's hear from each of you on that.

Scott: I'm okay with the testing.

Moderator: You mean ongoing, continued?

Scott: Yeah, I don't have a problem with that. I kind of like to know that everything is okay.

Moderator: Soil or blood testing?

Scott: Both, to be honest.

Moderator: So it doesn't bother you. You feel perfectly comfortable with an agency coming in and testing your children, your family, on an ongoing, regular basis?

Eddie: I honestly don't mind the testing. It's all the hoopla and then they test and leave and you don't know what they found. When they came up the street, they tested the neighbor to the east of me and they asked him if it would be okay to jump over the fence and test my place. So unless the neighbor talked to them, I didn't have a clue they even tested my place. So soil testing is not a biggy.

Moderator: What if they find levels a little bit higher?

Eddie: I'll wish them a lot of luck digging up that much dirt.

Moderator: Pat, what do you think should be done as to the future? one option might be nothing, one might be soil testing only, one might be blood and soil testing....

Pat: Assuming that they are continuing with this kind of thing in our area, I think soil testing is okay. It is the least invasive thing that can be done. When they came to my house, they did come inside and spent a fair amount of time testing dust balls and paint and things like that, but that's okay because we live in a very old house and I wanted to make sure, too, that we didn't have lead in the paint on the walls, which often happens in older homes. I think that level of testing is okay, if they find something of concern. Go ahead, I would say, and do more, particularly for the people who are at risk, and my understanding is that those at risk are children of a certain age developmentally.

Moderator: So if they find something they could do more like what?

Pat: Then that might indicate more blood testing is needed.

Moderator: So do soil testing first and if that is fairly high, then do blood testing?

Pat: Right, but as we mentioned before, education and keeping the public informed all along the way to let you know what is happening....We did get a number of letters, some of them I didn't understand.

Moderator: Who were they from? The EPA?

Pat: I'm not sure. There were a number of agencies involved and I got lost in the shuffle.

Ty: The public health agencies.

Moderator: Was it credible?

Pat: What they said? Reasonably, I think.

Moderator: But it was hard to understand?

Pat: Some of it. Some of it was vague enough. I had a little bit of trouble reading their analysis chart -- that was just me probably.

Moderator: Francis, what do you think should be done?

Francis: Have they had any incidents of problems among children or otherwise from the soil? Or from the materials they claim are in the soil to affect health in the last fifty years?

Moderator: Is anyone aware of any findings like that? What if you knew they hadn't?

Francis: If I knew they hadn't? I would be calling. When they test my soil and tell me I have arsenic in it and it's been hauled in from somewhere else.

Moderator: So you are saying look at the statistics?

Francis: I am saying they make work.

Moderator: Lila, what do you think should be done?

Lila: If they were going to come and test mine, they need to go back out in my garden, because we have had a garden on that property and I still raise a garden, even though I've been alone nearly 16 years now. I raised three children there and I have 19 grandchildren who have been at my place a lot and their favorite place to be was not on the grass but out in my garden area digging in the dirt.

Moderator: Were you ever concerned?

Lila: No, in fact, where we live, I don't think Mr. Adleman knows this, but that used to be where the homes were built originally, just wood homes, for the smelters down there. That is where it was. They even found an old pipe that had been used for a well.

Moderator: So Lila, I am sensing from you that they had reason to be concerned in spotty places, but they have overkill now?

Lila: Yes, that is my feeling, because I know they had higher readings in some areas, and most of it was like she said - there were three different smelters then. One up by the junior high school

Moderator: So what you would like to have done is test soil first?

Lila: Yes, and if they have done it all this time and found nothing more, and they skipped some -- that is why I think if they were really concerned they would have tested everyone's soil.

Moderator: Deanne, what do you think should be done?

Deanne: I think that soil testing is important. We requested our own set of soil tests, so when they took a test they put some in their bag and some in a bag for us. They gave us our own sample.

Moderator: Why did you do that?

Deanne: We opted for that. They said they do that free of charge.

Moderator: What is the purpose?

Deanne: Because we were concerned that it was their statistics and their results against no one else's. There was no check system. Because my husband is an engineer, he said he would like to have that available to him so he can take it somewhere and have it analyzed independently and make sure I felt comfortable with their assessment.

Moderator: Did he do it?

Deanne: No, because they came back and said oh, no problem, but 10 feet away they had a problem. Ten feet away from our property they hauled away all the dirt.

Moderator: That tells me you weren't overly concerned.

Deanne: It makes me wonder if the house across the street really had a problem. They gave us the report of the statistics. I guess what I am saying is it is important to have the testing, but I think we need a fuller balance. You need a blood test. You need a lot of things to be able to say here are all the pieces of the pie and let people have a choice. I think some people felt that had no choice.

Moderator: So what about blood testing?

Deanne: Great. They never did it at our house.

Moderator: Should they do that ongoing?

Deanne: I'm wondering if they test it once and there are no levels to be concerned about, why there might be a concern later. I would like to understand why those levels would change. Why would it change later?

Moderator: How would you feel about regular, routine blood testing, maybe for a period of five years?

Deanne: Sure. I would much rather do that than have them do that in some (unclear).

Moderator: We're going to talk about that later. Kelli, what do you think?

Kelli: I think that the soil and blood testing is okay, but I think that educating the public more about what is going on and why is important. Is there really any need for concern? If there has never been any one solitary case of lead levels high in child in anyone in the area, then why are they spending the money? the government spends money so freely.

Moderator: Some might say it is preventive, to make sure it doesn't occur.

Kelli: But why would it increase if there is no more smelter?

Moderator: So once tested, keep testing?

Kelli: I would agree with periodic testing or whatever, but I don't think it would increase. I don't know, though.

Moderator: Ty, what is your view?

Ty: I think there are many more important issues than this one in Sandy. Why are we spending a whole hour on it? All we need are a few blood tests of children that are at risk. It would not cost much and anyone can do it. The city can do it or the public health agencies that organized it. We ought to have a new round of blood tests in five years to see if there is a problem and then forget about it. Of younger children again.

Moderator: What if tomorrow the EPA says in the paper that more soil removal is necessary? You are telling me enough already and we are taking care of the problem. You feel comfortable with what they have done already, but what if this is a continuous thing?

*****: People will want better proof, education.

Eddie: When the EPA says it, you don't have a choice anyway.

Moderator: Do you have a choice?

Eddie: No. I know of an instance where someone wants to keep their big old tree, and they were told if you keep the tree and cut it down some day, it will be considered hazardous waste and this is what it will cost you to get rid of it. It was astronomically expensive, so what choice do you have?

Moderator: So it sounds like you would take them to task if you learned that the EPA was still looking to dig up more yards? You would ask them why. Let me give you two possible alternatives. Write down your preference here. The set up: suppose the EPA notified you that soil testing in your neighborhood indicated elevated levels of lead. Choice one: Either remove or replace the top 18 inches of soil, sod, nearly all vegetation, and perhaps some fences and sidewalks.

That is the first choice. The second choice: to institute a Community Protection Measures Program, or a CPM, composed of medical monitoring of blood lead levels that would be taken by a local health agency among residents who choose to be tested. Public education, management of soil excavations in the area, and replacement of soil as needed. So the first choice is to remove soil as they have done. The second one is to institute a CPM and take blood samples from those who opt to be tested, manage soil excavations, and replace soil as needed. How many of you would favor

having them take care of it and remove the soil? The rest of you I assume would prefer the CPM? Why do you favor the CPM?

Francis: I prefer that because that indicates right from the very beginning if the population itself is really affected, the people who live in the area, and if it isn't being affected, then why bother the soil?

Moderator: So you are saying that the other option is not useful, that there is no need to remove it. Are there some key components here why a CPM would be preferable?

Ty: Most of these people garden and I garden, too. I understand plants and how they get minerals out of the ground, but it is just not a problem. Under low levels, it has never been demonstrated to be a human health problem.

Moderator: Why do you think the EPA is pushing this?

Ty: I don't know. It's because they have money to spend from Superfund and they ought to be spending it in more important places.

Francis: On other things, that's right.

Pat: With these two scenarios you gave us, it is a question of rough-shod or tactful and most of us would prefer the tactful with the government not reaching in and saying this is what we are going to do and to heck with you. If they were to do it this way, they would show they are not bulldozing ahead, but they are taking it step by step, checking with us all along the way to get approval.

Moderator: What would you do if you disagreed with a decision by the EPA -- for instance, if they said by the way, we are going to remove some of your soil. Would you just accept it or would you take some action, get involved? Very realistically, what do you think your actions would be, if any?

Scott: If they came and said they were still having problems and needed to continue, I'm not a long termer where I live now. We'll probably move in the next five years anyway, and that would probably quicken the decision a bit. If we have continuing problems and skepticism about the danger of the soil, I might get the family together and move sooner.

Moderator: Would it have any impact on your property value?

Scott: From the sounds of it, yes. If someone is going to move in, they are going to know what is going on. It might.

Deanne: But homes in Sandy are selling like crazy. No one has put a sign on their lawn saying 'Could be hazardous for your health. Don't buy this home.'

Eddie: Wait until you sell yours.

Deanne: I just think like Ty said, we have eaten out of our garden for years. We bought our home for the landscape and the trees -- that is why we moved there. We would fight it. We get it tested independently and make sure that the levels were accurate. We would find out if there were other options.

Moderator: You would fight the soil removal?

Deanne: We would find out first if it is accurate. It would take time. People have not done it. When I asked that gentleman if we could have a sample of the soil, too, I asked him if others had asked for it and he said no, no one wants to take the time.

Moderator: Is it your sense that the community is fairly strong and if they did not want soil removal, they would win? Who is stronger? Would the EPA win or the people who favor the CPM? Do you think the people would have enough strength to oppose it?

Ty: People in Sandy aren't organized. This issue is not critical enough to organize politically over, so the agencies would end up having the last say.

Moderator: Would the rest of you agree that this is not an issue you could get all pumped up about?

*****: It is not an issue until it happens to you. No one here has had their soil taken.

Moderator: What would it take to get a grass roots rebellion going?

*****: I think a larger number of homes would have to be affected. There just haven't been many.

Moderator: let me recap and then I have just a couple more questions. You seem to have taken a little bit of a turn on me. When we first started talking, many of you with young children sounded like you wanted these studies done as a preventive measure. Let's make sure that we do what is safe and prudent. As we have talked through this it sounds like you would rather not have automatic soil removal if there is a question. You would like to see other measures taken first. Am I reading you correctly?

*****: For me, my concern in the beginning, my concern was for my children's safety. If they can prove to me that their health will be affected, then yes, get the soil out. I think the problem has

been that it is skeptical as to the need. The concern is still there -- everyone is concerned about health -- but I am not certain it is a true health issue. That is where I still feel like I am a 9 at concern level, but I'm not sure it is an issue to be worried about.

Moderator: Do you feel like you have some control? Some say-so in this? If you did disagree, do you feel like you would be heard?

*****: We would be heard, but we may not be listened to.

Moderator: Who do you think would be a credible spokesperson on this issue? Who could come out in the paper and say this is the truth? What is the best source of education?

*****: They all have agendas.

Francis: I remember someone coming around and handing us a paper telling us there is lead in the area and they will be testing the properties.

Moderator: What if someone from the University of Utah came, for instance, and said this is a vital issue or this is a bunch of garbage? Or someone from Sandy City or the state government? is there a credible source?

*****: I have gotten skeptical enough that you always have to wonder what their vested interest is? Who is paying them? It is not the way I'd like to be, but comes from experience, I guess. Are they pushing it because there is another reason I have not been told about or cannot see? Who would I trust? A doctor or the AMA or someone from the U? I don't know. Generally there is something.

Moderator: Let me revisit this CPM and blood testing. Would you be willing to have your blood tested annually by a local health agency to make sure you did not have an elevated level of lead? Would all of you be willing to do that?

Deanne: I would, but I would also rather do it through my own health care providers. If they were to come and ask me to draw blood, I would prefer to get my own doctor to test it.

Moderator: Interesting, because back to the trust level, you are getting an extra soil sample to make sure that they are not duping you and you want your doctors to make sure the tests are accurate. There is quite a high level of distrust.

*****: I think it goes back to what Pat was saying, it makes you wonder. Maybe they need to do this to take care of another agency in the federal government. Or maybe they need to get federal funding for this. They do not always tell the whole picture. We get half of it.

Moderator: Do you agree with that, Ty?

Ty: There has not been good community follow up sharing results and information. We do need a newsletter that will update us all on the status of the project and what the future is. I do trust the analyses of the labs. I don't think anyone is trying to pull anything. It is just that most people do not have enough background to judge in order to trust, mainly because they have not been good at information sharing.

Moderator: Eddie looked like he was not quite ready to have his blood drawn.

Eddie: I have no problem with that, but I prefer to get it done by my physician at the same time.

Moderator: Do you think it would take an incentive to get people to have their children have their blood tested annually for five years?

*****: I don't think it would work well. We can't even get some people to immunize their children. I don't think the people in general -- well, there is always a handful that won't follow through with stuff like that.

Moderator: We did a few groups a while back on this issue and for those people just knowing that everything was okay was enough of an incentive. Maybe a McDonald's Happy Meal or a ticket to Discovery Zone....

*****: I really don't think that would get people to do it. On the whole. I only think there is a handful of people that will do it, but I don't think that is an incentive. The kids will do it then, but you have to have the parents take the kids.

Moderator: What about a \$50 gift certificate or a savings bond if they do it three years in a row? Or a hundred dollars after five years in a row?

Deanne: I look at the challenge we have in school and having to tell parents that we will not educate their child unless they are immunized, but we still had parents who did not care.

Moderator: What about you as parents?

*****: If this were proven to me that this is a concern, I will have it done anyway. If I need to have this level of concern, I will do it.

Moderator: If the EPA said they had to remove the soil in your neighborhood and in your yard, would you have the children's blood tested?

*****: Yes.

Moderator: By your own doctors?

*****: Oh, yes.

Moderator: Any other final comment on this issue? We have covered a lot of ground, and Ty is right -- there are a lot of other issues out there.

Ty: The next question is who is paying to have us study this issue?

*****: You asked what source we trust and I think it is hard for me to trust anyone entirely. I trust the medical field to a degree and I trust the news media to a degree. I think we are responsible ourselves to gather information. When things come home through the schools to the children, I trust that process because I have seen what it takes for the information to get through the school legally. It has to meet certain criteria. If something came from the school saying that we have a health issue in the community with blood poisoning and 24 students at the school have been tested and their blood levels are high, so we are encouraging parents to test the blood levels, I would do it in a minute. That to me is a reliable source.

Moderator: Interesting. I am going to answer Ty's question just so you won't wonder all the way home. My sponsor is American Smelting and Refinery Company. It's a company that owned that smelter many, many years ago for a very short period of time but have basically been stuck with the bill here. What they are trying to do is find out ways that residents can feel comfortable. They want to be preventive but reasonable, too. They wanted to see if the CPM program is something of interest to you that could make you feel comfortable? Any comments on that?

Francis: I just wanted to say that the last smelter was about 1908 and this company actually bought it after that thinking they might use it and didn't and they are the ones who have really been hurt.

Moderator: Do the rest of you agree with that?

*****: I do.

Moderator: Any final parting shots? Ty, what is your reaction to that?

Ty: We have made historical mistakes in the past because we didn't have government control and this is a way of paying for it through Superfund. I think the law is working properly. We have to clean up mistakes that were made by industry.

Moderator: Do you think this company is on the right track with the CPM program? Most of you think the CPM program is the best way to go, it sounds like. Thank you all for being here. Sounds like education is needed. What if the company put something in the school newspaper?

Deanne: They would have to have lots of facts to back them up.

Ty: If they could explain who the lab was where things were tested, I know they were all done independently and I don't think there is any way they could have skewed the results. There is a minor problem in the way the sampling was done possibly. It was not carefully controlled, but my yard was sampled and I saw where they took the samples and they were idiots, but they would not listen to me when I asked them questions about the samples, so that needs to be explained. Why does one adjacent property show results and the other doesn't? They were not careful about what they were doing?

Moderator: Would you read something that came on your doorstep about this? If a local health agency had statistics? By the way, there has been no data to show there is any problem at all. Is that the kind of information you are looking for? And what is the most credible forum for it? Schools would not work for some of you. What about something on your doorstep?

Francis: I would read it for sure.

Ty: The forum that most Sandy residents see is the newsletter. I would suggest a well written test to put in the newsletter. A lot of people do not trust what comes out of city hall, but that would be a good place to communicate with residents in the quadrant.

Moderator: What about someone like you who is environmentally astute?

Ty: Have it reviewed by a third party. A public health authority from the U, if they have anyone up there.

Deanne: I would like to hear the pros and the cons. I would like to hear from a family that had it removed and their feelings on it. In defense of the process, because I think everyone can stand back and be critical, but they are trying.

Moderator: Do you think ASARCO needs to tell its side of the story? That they bought it after the fact for a brief period of time? So it would not sound like a sob story or like they are trying to get sympathy, but so that people can understand?

Francis: I think it would be a wise move.

Pat: If people are up front with you, you are likely to be more receptive and understanding. Not if they are trying to hide something or if they have ulterior motives.

Moderator: You mentioned the word 'mystery' earlier and I found that interesting.

Kelli: Obviously there is not a big major concern here and why are they stuck with the bill? Why is it something that they have to deal with?

Francis: Because they are still the only company that still exists.

Moderator: They are going to get sued by the EPA. The suits are out there.

Francis: Yes, and it is the EPA that is doing this. They want to change the particle standards now.

Eddie: You better hope that it does get changed, too.

Moderator: Going back to that, the EPA did all of the sampling and that sounded like an issue for you. No checks and balances, someone said. Thank you all for coming. You have been a great group.